

## REMARKS

The present Amendment responds to the Action mailed June 24, 2002 in the above-referenced case. Claims 2-10, and 12-18 are standing for examination. The Examiner rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 2-10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rogers et al. (US 5,946,386) hereinafter Rogers.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art provided by the Examiner. Applicant herein provides convincing argument to more particularly point out the subject matter regarded as patentable, and to distinguish unarguably over the reference of Rogers as cited and applied by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Rogers. Applicant points out to the Examiner that applicant specifically claims receiving identifying and connecting Internet protocol network telephony (IPNT) calls. Applicant's specification specifically supports the claimed IPNT teaching that computers simulate telephones through software, microphones, and speakers, and telephony data between such equipped computers is transmitted over Internet connections and directed by servers. In the IPNT world IP addresses are used instead of telephone numbers, and there are differences in the way data packets are formulated and transmitted. Moreover, what may be termed routing is done by such as IP switches and hubs, wherein destination addresses may be changed.

Applicant argues that Rogers teaches voice over Internet which cannot read on true IPNT as described and claimed in applicant's invention. Column 10 lines 14-21 of Rogers teaches that connections to a system user 113 are created by the call management computer 101 selecting an available,

appropriate CO trunk inbound 105 and establishing a call to the PBX 104 or to remote system users over additional trunk 102 to the central office 103. The PBX 104 or CO 103 responds to the call setup commands depending on the type of trunk and circuit (including voice-over-Internet and other digital services). Rogers teaches that in order for the call management system to provide intelligent call management capabilities, all calls are converted to standardized bus signals for the circuit switches 204 and telephony signal buses 210 in order to be utilized by the DSPs (col. 17, lines 1-9, col. 18 lines 37-56).

Rogers provides absolutely no enabling disclosure of receiving and routing IPNT calls as disclosed and claimed in applicant's invention. Column 22, lines 43-47 of Rogers specifically teaches that Fig. 1 shows 4 different types of callers: an outside voice caller 113, an outside Fax caller 119 and an outside data caller 120. Rogers states that these callers all use the same "One Number" to call the same system user 111 and they may do so all at the same time.

Applicant argues that clearly, the voice-over-Internet calls received at the management computer 101 are not Internet calls using IP addresses (IPNT) as taught and claimed in applicant's invention, but direct dialed POTS numbers wherein the Internet is merely used as a data network.

Applicant argues that claim 2 is patentable over the art of Rogers as Rogers fails to teach IPNT calls as claimed. Claims 3-9 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Applicant believes claim 10, is also patentable over the art of Rogers as argued on behalf of claim 2 above. Claim 12 is patentable at least as depended upon a patentable claim.

Claim 13 also incorporates the patentable limitations of IPNT. Applicant believes claim 13 is patentable as argued on behalf of claim 1 above. Claims 14-18 are also patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination as amended have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,

Igor Neyman, et al.

by \_\_\_\_\_

  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys  
Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457

**Version With Markings to Show Changes Made**

There are no changes made in the claims or the specification in the present amendment.